Commitment to Diversity and Its Influence on Athletic Department Outcomes

George Cunningham
Texas A&M University

The purpose of this research was to propose a multidimensional construct of commitment to diversity, develop a questionnaire to measure the respective mindsets, and to consider outcomes of such commitment. In Study 1 (*N* = 199 undergraduate students), a questionnaire was developed and its validity evidence based internal structure supported through confirmatory factor analysis. Results from Study 2 (*N* = 593 NCAA Division II administrators) indicated that the factor structure of the commitment to diversity questionnaire was equivalent across sex and race. Finally, results from Study 3 (*N* = 911 administrators from 258 NCAA Division I athletic departments) indicated that the collective commitment mindsets of department personnel interacted with the diversity in the department to influence three departmental outcomes: attraction of a diverse fan base, employee satisfaction, and creativity. Results are discussed in terms of contributions to the literature.

Changing demographic trends, legal mandates, social pressures, and various business-case initiatives have all resulted in an increasingly diverse workforce (van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). The presence of such heterogeneity has both positive and negative effects for athletic teams and the organizations in which they are situated. Diverse groups, relative to their homogeneous counterparts, sometimes have strained communication patterns (Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, & Forrest, 1993), are less likely to develop a common in-group identity (Cunningham, 2007a), and have members who express less commitment and intention to remain in the coaching profession (Cunningham & Sagas, 2004a). At the individual level, dissimilarity from others is related to internalized feelings of being different (Cunningham, 2007b), increased job stress (Krane & Barber, 2005), lower levels of psychological attachment to the group (Cunningham & Sagas, 2004c), and greater turnover intentions (Cunningham, 2007b). Despite these potential negative effects, researchers have also demonstrated that when effectively managed, diversity can bring real benefits to the organization, such as increased donations among nonprofit sport organizations (Siciliano, 1996) and better decision making on coaching staffs, which ultimately improves performance (Cunningham & Sagas, 2004b). Indeed, the social psychology literature suggests that, in groups where diversity is valued and seen as an asset to the organization, the presence of

The author is with Texas A&M University, Laboratory for Diversity in Sport, Department of Health and Kinesiology, 4243 TAMU, College Station, TX.

differences can result in better decision making, higher employee affect and performance gains (Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, & Neale, 1998; Hopkins, Hopkins, & Mallette, 2001; van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004; van Knippenberg & Haslam, 2003; see also McKay, Avery, Tonidandel, Morris, Hernandez, & Hebl, 2007, for similar arguments). In short, organizations that demonstrate a commitment to diversity are likely to reap the benefits thereof.

Despite the presumed importance of commitment to diversity, the literature devoted to this topic is limited in several respects. First, researchers have solely focused on the organization's commitment to diversity, as opposed to examining the commitment levels of that entity's employees (Ryan, West, & Carr, 2003; Hopkins et al., 2001). Such an anthropomorphic focus fails to consider that it is the people within the organization that establish its values, beliefs, and assumptions—that is, its culture (Schneider, 1987). Second, previous conceptualizations of commitment to diversity have been unidimensional; for instance, Ryan et al. defined the construct as "perceptions of the organization's concern regarding managing diversity" (p. 649). This approach fails to recognize the multidimensional nature of the construct, or that the different commitment mindsets can have a varied impact on subsequent outcomes (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

The purpose of this research, therefore, was to propose and examine a multidimensional model of commitment to diversity. In drawing from Meyer and Herscovitch's framework, I argue that commitment to diversity can take three forms—affective, continuance, and normative. In three separate studies, I examine the validity evidence of a new three-factor commitment to diversity (Studies 1, 2, and 3), the influence of personal demographics (Studies 1 and 2), the potential for invariance of the new measure across race and sex (Study 2), and the impact of an athletic department's collective commitment to diversity on subsequent organizational outcomes (Study 3). In the following sections, I outline the theoretical basis for the new conceptualization and then present the hypotheses tested in each study.

Theoretical Framework

According to Meyer and Herscovitch (2001), "commitment is a force that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets" (p. 301). As this definition suggests, commitment represents a stabilizing force that also provides direction for subsequent attitudes and behaviors. Note, however, that there is not a single form, or mindset, of commitment, nor is there is a single target, or focus, of one's commitment. Rather, Meyer and Herscovitch argued that commitment is multidimensional in nature, such that people desire to follow a course of action, perceive a cost with not doing so, or feel an obligation to follow said action. These three commitment mindsets have generally been termed *affective*, *continuance*, and *normative* commitment, respectively (see also Meyer & Allen, 1991). The authors further argued that commitment could be expressed toward various foci. The efficacy of this conceptualization has been realized in past studies, as researchers have found that individuals express different commitment mindsets to various targets, including the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991), organizational change (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Cunningham, 2006), and one's occupation (Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000).

In drawing from Meyer and Herscovitch's (2001) framework, commitment to diversity is defined here as *a force or mindset that binds an individual to support diversity*. Note that the definition allows for the target of the commitment to be varied, including one's workplace, university, athletic team, and so on. The mindset that binds the individual to this course of action can reflect (a) a desire to support diversity because of the belief in its inherent benefits (*affective commitment to diversity*), (b), a recognition that there are costs associated with failure to provide support for diversity (*continuance commitment to diversity*), and/or (c) a sense of obligation to provide support for diversity (*normative commitment to diversity*). This rationale suggests that commitment to diversity is multidimensional in nature and that the different dimensions (mindsets) are conceptually, and therefore empirically, distinct. Therefore, I hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 1:   Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to diversity are empirically distinct constructs.

This hypothesis was tested in Studies 1, 2, and 3. In the following section, I highlight the hypotheses explicitly examined only in Study 1.

Study 1

In addition to examining the existence of a multidimensional model of commitment to diversity, I examined the antecedents and outcomes of those commitment forms. In terms of antecedents, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) argued that an affective commitment is likely to develop when people are intrinsically motivated to pursue a course of action, when they recognize the value of that action, and/or when they derive part of their personal identity from association with that entity (see also Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Shamir, 1991). People are likely to foster a continuance commitment when they have high personal investments in that entity that would otherwise be lost if their commitment waned (Becker, 1960) or when they have no alternative but to provide such support. Finally, normative commitment is likely to materialize when there is an internalized set of norms related to appropriate conduct, when people feel the need to reciprocate support because of the benefits they receive, and/or when they feel a sense of obligation because of the psychological contract with that entity (see also Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer, Allen, & Topolnytsky, 1998).

In the current project, I examined the influence of personal demographics on the development of commitment to diversity mindsets. In most sport organizations today, White, heterosexual men hold key power positions (Fink, Pastore, & Riemer, 2001; Shaw, 2007); thus, from a social identity theory perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), women, racial minorities, and sexual minorities are all likely to be considered out-group members in these contexts. Such out-group status helps explain the prejudice and discrimination women, racial minorities, and sexual minorities oftentimes face in the sport context (Anderson, 2002; Lawrence, 2005; Shaw, 2006). Given these poor work experiences, persons who do not represent the typical majority in organizations might be more inclined, relative to their majority counterparts, to support workplace diversity because of what it means for

them and others like them. Conversely, there are various reports of majority members' backlash toward diversity and diversity initiatives in the workplace (Avery, 2003; Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica, & Friedman, 2004), potentially because of threat such efforts pose to their status and power within their organizations. Thus, White, heterosexual males might be relatively less likely to support workplace diversity.

Of course, the influence of demographic characteristics might vary based on the commitment mindset. In integrating this literature with Meyer and Herscovitch's (2001) framework, I argue that women, racial minorities, and sexual minorities, relative to their majority counterparts, are more likely to see the value in workplace diversity and potentially derive part of their personal identity from such heterogeneity (van Knippenberg & Haslam, 2003), thereby deriving higher levels of affective commitment. Further, because of their status as out-group members, women and minorities might also be more likely to feel a sense of obligation to support diversity in the workplace; thus, their normative commitment levels should also be higher than those of majority members. Finally, people are likely to express a continuance commitment if they believe they have something to lose by not doing so. Again, women and minorities might perceive they have more to lose—such as opportunities in the workplace—if diversity is absent from the organization. Alternatively, however, majority members might also perceive a high cost of not supporting diversity, especially if diversity represents a major organizational initiative. Thus, the following hypotheses focus on the effects of demographic characteristics on affective and normative commitment to diversity:

Hypothesis 2:   Women, racial minorities, and sexual minorities will express a greater affective commitment to diversity than will their majority counterparts.

Hypothesis 3:   Women, racial minorities, and sexual minorities will express a greater normative commitment to diversity than will their majority counterparts.

Thus, the purpose of Study 1 was to examine the degree to which the three commitment to diversity mindsets were empirically distinct (Hypothesis 1) as well as the influence of personal demographics on those mindsets (Hypotheses 2 and 3). These hypotheses were tested with a sample of students in physical activity classes. The specific methods and data analytic approach is described in the following sections.

Methods

Participants

Data were collected from 199 undergraduate students at a large, public university in the Southwest United States. All students were enrolled in physical activity classes. The sample consisted of 97 (48.7%) men and 102 (51.3%) women. In terms of racial composition, most participants were White ($n = 155$, 77.9%), followed by Hispanic ($n = 21$, 10.6%), Asian ($n = 12$, 6.0%), African American ($n = 5$, 2.5%), "Other" ($n = 4$, 2.0%), and two who did not provide their race. The mean age was 20.33 years ($SD = 1.90$).

Measures

A questionnaire measuring commitment to diversity was developed for the study. During the first stage, a definition of the general construct and of the specific mindsets (as articulated previously) was developed, and items reflecting each mindset were developed. Following Fraenkel and Wallen's (2000) guidelines, the definitions and representative items were then distributed to three academicians, who examined the scale for validity evidence based on test content. Based on their comments and suggestions, three items for each mindset were retained for the final questionnaire. A description of the final questionnaire and other items included in the study follows.

Commitment to diversity.   To ensure that all participants had a uniform understanding of diversity, the following definition was provided: "Diversity refers to any way in which people differ. This includes, but is not limited to, differences based on race, sex, age, class, sexual orientation, disability, religion, values, attitudes, and functional background." Participants were then directed to "please think about diversity at the university and then indicate your level of support, or lack thereof, by responding to the following items using the scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). There are no right or wrong answers." Affective commitment to diversity was measured with three items: "I believe in the value of diversity for this university," "Diversity is good for the university," and "Diversity makes an important contribution to the university." Items used to measure continuance commitment to diversity included, "I have too much at stake to not support diversity at the university," "I have a lot to lose by not supporting diversity," and "It would be too costly for me to not support diversity at this university." Finally, normative commitment to diversity was measured with the following items: "I feel a sense of duty to support diversity at this university," "It would be irresponsible of me to not support diversity at this university," and "I do not think it would be right of me to oppose diversity at this university."

Demographics.   Participants provided their demographic characteristics, including their sex, race, and age, as previously summarized. They also provided their sexual orientation on Kinsey's (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948) scale, which ranges from 0 (*exclusively heterosexual*) to 6 (*exclusively homosexual*).

Procedures

Data were gathered from students who were enrolled in physical activity classes at the university. As the courses are required for all students, the sample consists of a cross-section of the student body. Participation was voluntary, and all students consented to take part in the study. Approximately 10 minutes was required to complete the questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Means, standard deviations, bivariate correlations, and reliability coefficients (α) were calculated for all data. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 7.0 (Arbuckle, 2006) was used to examine validity evidence based on internal struc-

ture, thereby providing a test for Hypothesis 1. An oblique model was tested, errors were left independent, and maximum likelihood estimation was employed. Alternative models were also tested and statistically compared with the hypothesized model. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), comparative fit index (CFI), and Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) were used to examine model fit. Hypotheses 2–3 were examined through multivariate multiple regression. Similar to, but distinct from canonical correlation analysis, multivariate multiple regression "is the logical extension of ordinary multiple linear regression (MLR), wherein each of several continuous dependent variables is regressed on a set of continuous independent variables" (Lutz & Eckert, 1994, p. 666). Armstrong (2002) further notes that multivariate multiple regression analysis reduces family-wise error and, due to the stringent nature of the test, allows for maximal predictive ability (for an additional example, see Cunningham & Sagas, 2003).

Results and Discussion

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. All reliability estimates (α) were .70 or greater. Mean scores for affective commitment to diversity were highest, followed by normative commitment, and continuance commitment. One-sample t tests showed that mean scores for both affective commitment and normative commitment were significantly higher than the midpoint of the scale (4), $t = 19.36$, $p < .001$, and $t = 9.29$, $p < .001$, respectively. Continuance commitment, on the other hand, was significantly less than the midpoint of the scale, $t = -5.91$, $p < .001$. While the various commitment mindsets were all significantly related to one another, the most shared variance was 42% (between affective and normative commitment). Finally, both sex and sexual orientation held significant, bivariate correlations with affective and normative commitment.

Table 1   Descriptive Statistics (Study 1)

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Sex	—					
2. Race	.18*	—				
3. Sexual orientation	–.01	.01	—			
4. Affective commitment	.16*	–.09	.14*	—		
5. Continuance commitment	.01	.11	.09	.15*	—	
6. Normative commitment	.15*	–.13	.14*	.65***	.46***	—
Mean	.52	.79	.34	5.75	3.40	4.91
SD	.50	.41	1.17	1.28	1.42	1.38
Reliability (α)	—	—	—	.92	.70	.74

Notes. Sex coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; race coded as 0 = racial minority, 1 = White; sexual orientation measured from 0: *exclusively heterosexual* to 6: *exclusively homosexual*; *p* < .05; ***p* < .001.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1 predicted that affective, continuance, and normative commitment to diversity would be empirically distinct constructs. This was examined through a series of confirmatory factor analyses. The first model tested was the hypothesized three-factor model, which was a close fit to the data: χ^2 ($df = 24$, $n = 199$) = 38.12, $p < .05$; $\chi^2/df = 1.59$; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .02, .09) = .05; TLI = .97; CFI = .98.

In the first alternative model, I specified the item indicators for affective and normative commitment to load on a single latent factor, and the item indicators for continuance commitment to load on a second factor. This alternative model was justified by past research, which has shown that the two constructs are highly related to one another (Cunningham, 2006; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002. Results indicated that this model was a poor fit to the data: χ^2 ($df = 26$, $n = 199$) = 125.06, $p < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 4.81$; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .12, .16) = .14; TLI = .80; CFI = .89. The chi-square difference test indicated that the hypothesized model was a statistically better fit than was this alternative model: $\Delta\chi^2$ (2) = 86.94, $p < .001$.

In the third model, I specified all of the items to load on a single factor representing a global commitment to diversity. This model was also a poor fit to the data: χ^2 ($df = 27$, $n = 199$) = 217.25 $p < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 8.05$; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .17, .21) = .19; TLI = .63; CFI = .78. The chi-square difference test indicated that the hypothesized model also held a statistically better fit to the data then did this model: $\Delta\chi^2$ (3) = 179.13, $p < .001$.

Together, these findings suggest that the three commitment to diversity mindsets are distinct from one another and that the three-factor model of commitment to diversity is statistically superior to alternative models. Thus, Hypothesis 1 is supported.

Hypotheses 2 and 3 predicted that one's sex, race, and sexual orientation would predict affective commitment and normative commitment to diversity, respectively. Results of the multivariate multiple regression are presented in Table 2. The multivariate effects were significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .92$, F (6, 376) = 2.67, $p < .05$. Demographic variables explained 6% ($p < .01$) of the variance, with sex ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$) race ($\beta = -.13$, $p = .06$), and sexual orientation ($\beta = .13$, $p = .06$) all impacting one's affective commitment, though the effects of race and sexual orientation were only marginally significant. Consistent with the predictions, women, racial minorities, and persons who were not exclusively heterosexual expressed greater affective commitment to diversity than did men, Whites, or exclusive heterosexuals. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was generally supported.

Hypothesis 3, which predicted that one's demographic characteristics would predict normative commitment to diversity, was supported (see Table 2). The variables cumulatively explained 7% ($p < .01$) of the variance in the diversity mindset, and sex ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$), race ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .05$), and sexual orientation ($\beta = .14$, $p < .05$) all significantly contributed to the variance explained. As expected, women, racial minorities, and persons who were not exclusively heterosexual were all more likely to express a higher level of normative commitment to diversity than were their counterparts.

Three points are worth noting here. First, as expected, people who are traditionally in the minority in organizational contexts expressed greater affective and normative commitment to diversity than did their counterparts. In drawing from

Table 2   Effects of Personal Demographic Characteristics on Affective and Normative Commitment to Diversity (Study 1)

Dependent Variable	R^2	F	β	t
Affective commitment	.06	3.93**		
Independent variables				
sex			.18	2.51*
race			−.13	−1.86
sexual orientation			.13	1.89
Normative commitment	.07	4.56**		
Independent variables				
sex			.16	2.25*
race			−.18	2.57*
sexual orientation			.14	2.00*

Notes. Sex coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; race coded as 0 = racial minority, 1 = White; sexual orientation measured from 0: *exclusively heterosexual* to 6: *exclusively homosexual*; *p* < .05; **p* < .01.

commitment theory (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001), these results may be explained by the notion that women, persons of color, and sexual minorities are more likely draw part of their personal identity from the concept of diversity (van Knippenberg & Haslam, 2003) and also more likely, given their under-represented status (Shaw, 2007), to feel a sense of duty to support such efforts.

Second, the variance explained in the two commitment mindsets was relatively small (6–7%). Clearly, there is the potential for variance within groups. For instance, some men might support diversity more strongly than do some women, just as the commitment to diversity among some heterosexuals might mirror that of their gay, lesbian, and bisexual counterparts. Such variance might be due to other factors, such as life experiences, socialization agents, and organizational context. It is likely that the these factors contributed to the low variance explained by demographic characteristics alone. As another potential explanation, the student populations in most universities are evenly divided between men and women, and such was the case in the current study (see Table 1). Thus, women might not have perceived that they were in the minority in the university setting. From a social identity perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), this would suggest that their support of diversity would not likely vary from that of men's, as was observed in the current investigation. Finally, there were few sexual minorities in the study (see Table 1), and consequently, the results might differ when more GLB individuals were included.

Third, the sample of the study is potentially limiting. That is, some may argue that students' commitment to diversity at the university has little to do with employees' commitment to diversity in their sport organization. However, there is evidence that students' different commitment mindsets influence the diversity climate at the university. As one example, in 2008, students at Southern Oregon University marched for domestic rights for gays and lesbians on campus and

within the state—actions emblematic of one's commitment to diversity (French, 2008). Thus, understanding students' commitment mindsets is certainly a worthwhile endeavor. Notwithstanding this evidence, however, additional work is needed to evaluate utility of the new scale in the sport context. This evidence is provided in Studies 2 and 3.

Study 2

The purpose of Study 2 was to further examine the commitment to diversity construct, this time in the athletics setting. As Hanisch, Hulin, and Roznowski (1998) note, validity evidence of a construct or measure can only be seen through its repeated use in varied contexts. Thus, as outlined in further depth in the following sections, the purpose of this particular study was to examine commitment to diversity among NCAA Division II athletic administrators. In the spirit of Hanisch et al.'s (1998) recommendations, Hypotheses 1–3 were tested again in this study.

In addition to examining mean differences in the commitment to diversity mindsets, I also examined the potential for model invariance across race and sex. That is, I tested whether the model fit the data equally well for men and women, as well as for Whites and racial minorities. Byrne (2004, p. 272) notes:

> In substantive research that focuses on multigroup comparisons, it is typically assumed that the instrument of measurement is operating in exactly the same way, and that the underlying construct being measured has the same theoretical structure for each group under study. As evidenced from reviews of the literature, however, these two critically important assumptions are rarely, if ever, tested statistically.

As this quotation illustrates, making the assumption that the model fits equally well for all groups is flawed and can limit the understanding of a particular construct or scale.

In returning to the arguments presented in Study 1, there is some reason to believe that the model is invariant across race and sex, as the relationships among the constructs might vary based on group membership. For instance, because they have been traditionally under-represented and marginalized in sport organizations (Lawrence, 2005; Shaw, 2007), women and persons of color might perceive more of a sense of duty or obligation to support diversity in the workplace. Further, the belief that diversity positively contributes to the workplace might stem, at least in part, from this sense of obligation, or the normative mindset. If this is the case, then the relationship between affective and normative commitment to diversity might be stronger for women and persons of color than it is for men and Whites. Similar arguments could be posed for continuance commitment, such that the relationship between perceived costs associated with not supporting diversity (i.e., continuance commitment) and the feeling of wanting to (i.e., affective commitment) and needing to (i.e., normative commitment) support diversity might be stronger for women and racial minorities than it is for their counterparts.

In short, the relationships among the diversity mindsets might be stronger for women and persons of color than it would be for men and Whites. These differ-

ences would suggest that the model is not equivalent across race and sex. Given that these arguments are largely speculative in nature, a formal hypothesis was not advanced; rather, I examined this possibility guided by the following research question:

RQ1:   Is the commitment to diversity model invariant across race and sex?

Methods

Participants

Data were collected from 593 NCAA Division II athletic administrators. The sample consisted of 352 men (59.4%) and 231 women (39.0%; 10 persons did not provide their sex). Participants were mostly White ($n = 500$, 84.3%), followed by African American ($n = 53$, 8.9%), Hispanic ($n = 12$, 2.0%), and equal number of Asian Americans and persons who listed "other" ($n = 7$, 1.2%, respectively), and Native Americans ($n = 1$, 0.2%). Thirteen persons did not provide their race. The age distribution was relatively even: 18–30 years ($n = 124$, 20.9%), 31–40 years ($n = 148$, 25.0%), 41–50 years ($n = 166$, 28.0%), 51–60 years ($n = 117$, 19.7%), and over 61 years ($n = 27$, 4.6%), with 11 persons not providing that information. Finally, the mean organizational tenure was 9.12 years ($SD = 8.54$) while the mean occupational tenure was 15.24 years ($SD = 10.50$).

Measures

Participants received a questionnaire which requested them to respond to the nine commitment to diversity items and to provide their demographic information. The measures were the same as in Study 1, with a slight exception. While the target of diversity in Study 1 was the university in which the students were enrolled, the target in Study 2 was the athletic department in which the administrators worked. Thus, for example, the item in Study 1 that read "I believe in the value of diversity for this university," was reworded to read "I believe in the value of diversity for this athletic department." Similar changes were made to each of the items.

Procedures

The sampling frame included 1337 administrators representing all ($N = 239$) NCAA Division II universities. Where possible, information was mailed to the athletic director and her or his top five assistants, with the only exception being when fewer than five were listed on the department's website. Following Dillman (2000), multiple contacts were made with each administrator. A postcard was first mailed to the administrators, alerting them to the study and that they would be receiving a questionnaire in the coming week. The next week, questionnaire packets, which contained a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, a questionnaire, and a postage-paid return envelope, were distributed, and 418 persons responded to this questionnaire. One week later, another postcard was sent, reminding the administrators to complete the questionnaire. Four weeks after the

first questionnaire was distributed, a second questionnaire packet was distributed to all nonrespondents, and another 175 responding. Thus, the total response rate was 44.4%. Early and late respondents did not differ in any of their commitment to diversity mindsets, thereby suggesting that nonresponse bias is likely not a substantial concern (Dooley & Linder, 2003).

Data Analysis

Means, standard deviations, bivariate correlations, and reliability coefficients (α) were calculated for all data. This was also done for the following subsamples: men only, women only, Whites only, and racial minorities only. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 7.0 (Arbuckle, 2006) was used to examine validity evidence based on internal structure, thereby providing a test for Hypothesis 1. The RMSEA, CFI, and TLI were used to examine model fit. Hypotheses 2 and 3 were tested through 2×2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), with race (White, racial minority) and sex (men, women) serving as the independent variables and the three commitment mindsets serving as the dependent variables. Note that because sexual-orientation data were not collected in this study, only the effects of race and sex are examined. Finally, Byrne's (2004) guidelines for examining model invariance were followed to examine the research question: Is the commitment to diversity model invariant across race and sex?

Results and Discussion

Descriptive Statistics

Means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations are presented in Tables 3 and 4. For all samples, mean scores for affective commitment to diversity were highest, followed by normative commitment, and continuance commitment. While the various commitment mindsets were all significantly related to one another, the most shared variance was 53% (between affective and normative commitment) and was observed in the racial minority sample. Finally, sex and race were not correlated with any of the commitment mindsets.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1 predicted that affective, continuance, and normative commitment to diversity would be empirically distinct constructs. As with Study 1, this was examined through a series of confirmatory factor analyses. The first model tested was the hypothesized three-factor model, which was a close fit to the data: χ^2 ($df = 24, n = 593) = 110.52, p < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 4.62$; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .06, .09) = .07; TLI = .94; CFI = .97.

As with Study 1, an alternative model was then tested in which the item indicators for affective and normative commitment were specified to load on a single latent factor, and the item indicators for continuance commitment to load on a second factor. Results indicated that this model was a poor fit to the data: χ^2 ($df = 26, n = 593) = 289.55, p < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 11.14$; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .12, .15) = .13; TLI = .83; CFI = .90. The chi-square difference test indicated that the hypothe-

Table 3   Descriptive Statistics for the Entire Sample (Study 2)

Item	1	2	3	4	5
1. Sex	—				
2. Race	−.04	—			
3. Affective commitment	.07	.04	—		
4. Continuance commitment	−.03	.03	.19***	—	
5. Normative commitment	.06	.03	.65***	.46***	—
Mean	.40	.86	5.80	3.69	5.42
SD	.49	.34	1.19	1.64	1.28
Reliability (α)	—	—	.86	.85	.77

Notes. Sex coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; race coded as 0 = racial minority, 1 = White; ***$p < .001$.

sized model was a statistically better fit than was this alternative model: $\Delta\chi^2$ (2) = 179.03, $p < .001$.

A third model was then specified, this time with all of the items loading on a single factor representing a global commitment to diversity. This model was also a poor fit to the data: χ^2 (*df* = 27, *n* = 593) = 938.82 $p < .001$; χ^2/df = 34.77; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .23, .25) = .24; TLI = .42; CFI = .65. Expectedly, the chi-square difference test indicated that the hypothesized model was a statistically superior fit to the data than was this alternative model: $\Delta\chi^2$ (3) = 828.30, $p < .001$.

In all, these results mirror those in Study 1 and suggest that affective, continuance, and normative commitment to diversity mindsets are empirically distinct constructs. Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.

Hypotheses 2 and 3 predicted that racial and sex differences in affective and normative commitment to diversity, respectively. Mean scores are presented in Table 4. Results of the 2 × 2 MANOVA indicated that neither sex, Wilks' Λ = .99, F (2, 574) = 1.33, $p = .27$, race, Wilks' Λ = .99, F (2, 574) = .39, $p = .68$, nor the sex × race interaction, Wilks' Λ = .99, F (2, 574) = .88, $p = .42$, were significant. Thus, Hypotheses 2 and 3 were not supported.

Finally, several tests for invariance across sex and race were conducted to examine the study's research question. Model invariance across sex was first examined, with results indicating that the simultaneously predicted model—that is, the model with both the male-only and female-only data run together at once—was a close fit to the data: χ^2 (*df* = 48, *n* = 593) = 148.11, $p < .001$; χ^2/df = 3.09; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .05, .07) = .06; TLI = .93; CFI = .96. The covariance paths between the latent variables were then constrained in the constrained model. This model was also a close fit to the data: χ^2 (*df* = 51, *n* = 593) = 152.12, $p < .001$; χ^2/df = 2.98; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .05, .07) = .06; TLI = .93; CFI = .96. The chi-square difference test indicated that the two models were not significantly different: $\Delta\chi^2$ (Δdf = 3) = 4.01, $p > .05$. Thus, the model was equivalent, as the relationships were the same for men as they were for women.

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics for the Study Subsamples (Study 2)

Item	Men (n = 352)			Women (n = 230)			Whites (n = 499)			Racial minorities (n = 80)		
	AC	CC	NC	AC	CC	NC	AC	CC	NC	AC	CC	NC
AC	—			—			—			—		
CC	.19**	—		.23***	—		.18***	—		.32**	—	
NC	.69***	.45***	—	.58***	.50***	—	.64***	.46***	—	.73***	.49***	—
Mean	5.74	3.72	5.36	5.90	3.63	5.52	5.79	3.67	5.41	5.91	3.80	5.51
SD	1.23	1.60	1.31	1.10	1.70	1.22	1.15	1.63	1.26	1.35	1.73	1.42

Notes. AC = affective commitment to diversity; CC = continuance commitment to diversity; NC = normative commitment to diversity; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Invariance across race was then examined. The simultaneously predicted model, including both the Whites-only and racial minorities-only samples run together at the same time, was a close fit to the data: χ^2 ($df = 48$, $n = 593$) = 136.49, $p < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 2.84$; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .05, .07) = .06; TLI = .94; CFI = .97. I then constrained the covariance paths between the latent variables in the constrained model. This model was also a close fit to the data: χ^2 ($df = 51$, $n = 593$) = 141.37, $p < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 2.72$; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .05, .07) = .06; TLI = .94; CFI = .97. Results from the chi-square difference test indicated that the two models were equivalent, as they did not significantly differ: $\Delta\chi^2$ ($\Delta df = 3$) = 4.88, $p > .05$. Thus, the model fit equally well for both Whites and persons of color.

Collectively, these results continue to point to the sound psychometric properties of the commitment to diversity scale. As with Study 1, the reliability coefficients were all high and the instrument demonstrated sound validity evidence based on internal structure, as evidenced through the close fit of the three-factor model to the data. Further, tests for invariance indicated that the model fit the data equally well for various subgroups: men, women, Whites, and racial minorities.

Study 3

The impetus for conducting this research were the claims that organizations demonstrating a commitment to diversity were more likely to reap the benefits of diversity than were their counterparts (Chatman et al., 1998; Hopkins et al., 2001; McKay et al., 2007; van Knippenberg & Haslam, 2003; van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Further, conceptualizations of an organization's commitment to diversity were unidimensional in nature (e.g., Ryan et al., 2003), despite the considerable evidence that one's commitment to a course of action is multifaceted (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). The first two studies in this investigation were aimed at (a) developing a scale that could be used to measure one's commitment to diversity, and (b) examining the psychometric properties of that instrument. Indeed, results from both investigations point to the promise of the questionnaire in measuring people's commitment to diversity mindsets. The purpose of Study 3, then, was to return to the original contention and examine if sport organizations with a commitment to diversity are better able to realize diversity's positive effects than are their counterparts.

In again drawing from commitment theory, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) argued that affective commitment would hold the strongest association with desired behaviors, followed by normative and continuance commitment. They wrote, "Individuals who are committed primarily out of desire might have a stronger inclination to follow through on their commitment than those who are committed primarily out of obligation or to avoid costs" (pp. 312–313). In the context of the current study, people might exhibit their strongest behavioral support of diversity when they also have a high affective commitment to that cause. For instance, the students referenced in Study 1 who marched for the rights of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals (French, 2008) likely expressed an affective commitment to diversity—that is, they supported diversity because they *wanted to*, more so than because they felt they *ought to* or *had to*.

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) also recognized, however, that people express multiple commitment mindsets simultaneously. It is possible, for instance, for one to express high levels of all three commitment mindsets, just as it is possible to express high affective and normative commitment while also expressing low continuance commitment, or any of the possible eight combinations. These different combinations might have varying influences on subsequent behavioral outcomes. For instance, Herscovitch and Meyer (2002), in their study of employee commitment to organizational change initiatives, found that people who exhibited prosocial behavior (i.e., behaviors aimed at ensuring the change's success) also had a combined high affective and high normative commitment profile. To date, however, similar examinations examining the possible interactive effects of the different diversity mindsets are limited.

To examine the central claims driving the study—that organizations demonstrating a commitment to diversity were more likely to reap the benefits of diversity than were their counterparts—requires examination of the commitment profile *and* the level of diversity in the workplace. Consider, for instance, Doherty and Chelladurai's (1999) theoretical model, in which sport organizations are likely to have the most positive outcomes when there is a culture that values diversity (akin to high commitment to diversity) and where diversity is high. However, other combinations, such as (a) high workplace diversity with a culture that values similarity (akin to low commitment to diversity), (b) low workplace diversity with a culture that values diversity, or (c) low workplace diversity with a culture of similarity are all likely to result in poorer organizational outcomes.

Together, both commitment theory (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001) and diversity-related theory (Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999) suggest that the three diversity mindsets and the sport organization's workplace diversity should work in concert to explain organizational outcomes. In this study, three such outcomes were examined: attraction of a diverse fan base, employee satisfaction, and creativity. The decision to include these outcomes was based on the literature hailing diversity's positive effects on identification with customer, employee affect, and the creativity of the solutions (Chatman et al., 1998; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Fink et al., 2001; Lovelace, Shapiro, & Weingart, 2001; Robinson & Dechant, 1997). Based on the aforementioned literature, the following research question guided the investigation:

RQ2:   What is the relationship among the different commitment to diversity mindsets, department diversity, and department outcomes (i.e., attraction of a diverse fan base, employee satisfaction, and creativity) among NCAA Division I university athletic departments?

Method

Participants

Participants were 911 (588 men, 310 women, 13 who did not provide their sex) NCAA Division I athletic administrators.

The sample was mostly White ($n = 727$, 79.8%), followed by African American ($n = 120$, 13.2%), Hispanic ($n = 18$, 2.0%), persons who listed "other" ($n = 12$, 1.3%), Asian Americans ($n = 9$, 1.0%), and Native Americans ($n = 5$, 0.5%). Fourteen persons did not provide their race. The age distribution was as follows: 18–30 years ($n = 113$, 12.4%), 31–40 years ($n = 264$, 29.0%), 41–50 years ($n = 232$, 25.5%), 51–60 years ($n = 249$, 27.3%), and over 61 years ($n = 39$, 4.3%), with 20 persons not providing that information. Finally, participants had worked in their organization for an average of 10.18 years ($SD = 9.12$) and in the athletics profession for an average of 17.05 years ($SD = 10.39$).

Measures

Participants received a questionnaire which requested them to provide their demographic information (as previously outlined) and to respond to items measuring the department's diversity, the administrator's commitment to diversity, and the department's organizational outcomes.

Department diversity.   Both sex and racial diversity of the department was assessed. For sex diversity, administrators marked the proportion of men and women who worked in the department. Responses options for each category ranged from 1 (*0–10%*) to 10 (*91–100%*). The standard deviation was then computed for each department, and that value's distance from zero (which would represent complete diversity) was used as the final diversity score. By way of example, consider the following two departments. Department A has 51–60% women (which would be a value of 6) and 41–50% were men (which would be a value of 5). The diversity score for this department is -.71 (0–.71). On the other hand, Department B has 91–100% men (which would be a value of 10) and 0–10% women (which would be a value of 1), for a diversity score of -6.36. Thus, larger values are representative of greater department diversity.

Likewise, administrators were asked to provide the proportion of athletic department personnel who were categorized into six different racial groups: African American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, White, and "other." The same formula previously described was used to compute the racial diversity score. For instance, a department with 0–10% African Americans (value of 1), 0–10% Asian Americans (value of 1), 0–10% Hispanics (value of 1), 71–80% Whites (value of 8), and 0–10% Native Americans (value of 1) would have a diversity score of -2.80.

Commitment to diversity.   Commitment to diversity was measured with the same instrument described in Study 2.

Department outcomes.   The three department outcomes were assessed with single item measures from Fink et al. (2001): "my athletic department attracts a diverse customer (fan) base," "my athletic department provides a work atmosphere in which employees are highly satisfied," and "my athletic department provides an opportunity to be creative." Participants responded to items using a 7-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Note that because the research question was concerned with the departmental outcomes, items were worded to reflect departmental outcomes (e.g., "employees are highly satisfied") rather than

individual outcomes (e.g., "I am highly satisfied"), as in Fink et al.'s original study.

Procedures

The procedures were the same as those for Study 2 (see Dillman, 2000). After generating a mailing list of the athletic director and her or his top five assistants ($N = 1937$) from all NCAA Division I universities ($N = 330$), postcards were mailed to alert the administrators of the upcoming study. One week later, a questionnaire packet containing a cover letter, questionnaire, and postage-paid return envelope was mailed, with a reminder postcard being mailed one week later. Four weeks after the mailing of the questionnaire packet, a second questionnaire was mailed to all nonrespondents encouraging their participation. In all 911 persons responded (600 after Round 1, 311 after Round 2), for a response rate of 47.03%. As in Study 2, early and late respondents did not differ in any of their commitment to diversity mindsets or in the departmental outcomes, thereby suggesting that nonresponse bias is likely not a substantial concern (Dooley & Linder, 2003).

Data Analysis

Means, standard deviations, bivariate correlations, and reliability coefficients (α) were calculated for all data. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 7.0 (Arbuckle, 2006) was used to examine validity evidence based on internal structure, thereby providing a further test of Hypothesis 1. As before, competing models were examined. The CFI, TLI, and RMSEA were used to assess model fit.

The primary research question guiding this study was concerned with the relationship among the different commitment to diversity mindsets, department diversity, and department outcomes (i.e., attraction of a diverse fan base, employee satisfaction, and creativity) among NCAA Division I university athletic departments. I first aggregated the data from the individual to the group level and then examined the research question through cluster analysis. Following Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006, see p. 593), a hierarchical cluster analysis was first conducted with a subsample of the data ($n = 20$), and changes in the agglomeration statistics were examined to determine the optimal number of clusters. Based on this information, a nonhierarchical cluster analysis was then computed with the entire sample to examine how the commitment mindsets and diversity dimensions clustered together. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was then computed with the cluster membership serving as the independent variable and the three department outcomes serving as the dependent variables.

Results and Discussion

Descriptive Statistics and Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 5. Consistent with the previous studies, (a) all of the commitment to diversity mindsets had acceptable reliability levels, (b) affective commitment had the highest mean score, followed by norma-

tive and continuance commitment, and (c) the three commitment mindsets were all significantly related to one another, with the affective and normative mindsets holding the strongest associations.

Also consistent with Studies 1 and 2, and in support of Hypothesis 1, the commitment to diversity questionnaire demonstrated validity evidence based on internal structure. The hypothesized model was a close fit to the data: χ^2 ($df = 24$, $n = 911$) = 126.57, $p < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 5.72$; RMSEA (90% C.I.: .06, .08) = .07; TLI = .95; CFI = .97. The chi-square difference test indicated that the hypothesized model was a superior fit to the both alternative model: affective and normative items loading on a single factor, $\Delta\chi^2$ (2) = 357.91, $p > .001$; all items loading on a single commitment to diversity factor, $\Delta\chi^2$ (3) = 1519.38, $p > .001$.

Data Aggregation

Because the research question was concerned with the effects of the *department's* commitment to diversity, data were aggregated from the individual to the group level. Interrater agreement (r_{wg}) values and eta square (η^2) values were examined to assess the statistical appropriateness of aggregating the data. Interrater agreement examines the extent to which members of a particular group agree in their ratings of a concept (e.g., affective commitment to diversity); eta square values, on the other hand, assess the degree to which there is sufficient variance between groups (see Bleise, 2000; Dixon & Cunningham, 2006). Only staffs with two or more respondents were included in the study (see Klein & Kozlowski, 2000). The mean r_{wg} was .66, slightly below the .70 cutoff recommended by James, Demaree, and Wolf (1993) as representing high agreement among group members. The mean eta square value (.38) was greater than the traditional cutoff of .20 (Florin, Giamartino, Kenny, & Wandersman, 1990). Together, these results suggest that (a) administrators from a given department generally agreed with one another concerning the study variables, and (b) there was substantial variance among the different departments. Thus, aggregation was statistically justified, and the departmental score was then computed by taking the mean of the responses from that

Table 5   Descriptive Statistics for the Entire Sample (Study 3)

Item	1	2	3	4	5
1. Sex	—				
2. Race	−.05	—			
3. Affective commitment	.12***	−.03	—		
4. Continuance commitment	−.01	−.11**	.15***	—	
5. Normative commitment	.07*	−.08*	.57***	.46***	—
Mean	.35	.82	6.14	4.00	5.79
SD	.48	.39	.97	1.70	1.12
Reliability (α)	—	—	.83	.87	.74

Notes. Sex coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; race coded as 0 = racial minority, 1 = White; ***$p < .001$.

entity. This resulted in the sample decreasing from 911 administrators to 258 departments.

Descriptive statistics for the aggregated data are presented in Table 6. Several points are worth highlighting here. First, most of the diversity indices were positively associated with the departmental outcomes, suggesting therefore, that as the mix of men and women and persons from different races increases, so too does the productivity of the workplace. Second, from a direct effects perspective, the commitment mindsets were not related to the diversity in the workplace and were marginally related to the department outcomes.

Cluster Analysis

Results from the hierarchical cluster analysis demonstrated support for a three-factor solution, as the agglomeration statistics increased by 64.34% in moving from the third to the second cluster groupings (5.58–9.17). This was the largest increase in the analysis. Thus, the subsequent nonhierarchical analysis was specified with three clusters.

Results of the nonhierarchical cluster analysis are presented in Table 7. An analysis of variance, followed by Student-Newman-Kewls post hoc analysis, indicated that the three clusters significantly differed from one another on each attribute. Departments in Cluster 1 ($n = 107$) had high levels of affective and normative commitment, with lower levels of continuance commitment. These workplaces also had high levels of sex and racial diversity; thus, those in Cluster 1 were termed *High Affective and Normative/Diverse*. Departments in the second cluster ($n = 81$) also had high levels of affective and normative commitment, but had less workplace diversity, both in terms of sex and race. These departments were dubbed *High Affective and Normative/Homogeneous*. In the final cluster solution ($n = 69$), departmental members expressed high levels of all three commitment to diversity mindsets, and the sex and racial diversity in these departments was the highest of any of the three clusters. As such, these departments were designated as *High Commitment/Diverse*.

Finally, a MANOVA was carried out to examine the influence of the cluster membership on departmental outcomes, with descriptive statistics presented in Table 8. The multivariate effects were significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .92$, $F (3, 502) = 3.74$, $p < .01$. Univariate analyses demonstrated significant effects for attracting diverse fans, $F (2, 254) = 6.87$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$, employee satisfaction, $F (2, 254) = 4.15$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$, and creativity, $F (2, 254) = 6.62$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. Student-Newman-Kewls post hoc analyses indicated that High *Affective and Normative/Diverse* and *High Commitment/Diverse* departments attracted a more diverse fan base and had greater employee satisfaction than did *High Affective and Normative/Homogeneous* departments. *High Commitment/Diverse* departments also had significantly greater creativity than did departments in the other two clusters.

These results, coupled with the descriptive statistics presented in Table 6, paint an interesting picture. A department's collective commitment to diversity, by itself, is unlikely to influence departmental outcomes. On the other hand, certain commitment profiles, when coupled with a workplace high in diversity, *are likely* to positively influence departmental outcomes. Thus, affective and normative

Table 6 Descriptive Statistics of the Aggregated Data (Study 3)

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Sex diversity	—							
2. Race diversity	.30***	—						
3. Affective commitment	.09	.05	—					
4. Continuance commitment	.01	.08	.11	—				
5. Normative commitment	.07	.05	.61***	.44***	—			
6. Attract diverse fans	.24***	.35***	.09	-.03	.05	—		
7. Satisfied employees	.14*	.06	.15*	-.07	.09	.33***	—	
8. Creative workplace	.19**	.19**	.28***	.01	.22**	.27***	.58***	—
Mean	-2.21	-2.95	6.13	4.02	5.78	4.35	4.71	5.43
SD	1.13	.42	.64	1.03	.72	1.03	.98	.76

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$.

Table 7   Results of Nonhierarchical Cluster Analysis (Study 3)

Item	Cluster 1 (n = 107)		Cluster 2 (n = 81)		Cluster 3 (n = 69)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Sex diversity	−1.73	.65	−3.50	.72	−1.47	.78
Racial diversity	−2.93	.40	−3.14	.32	−2.76	.47
Affective commitment	5.93	.72	6.13	.54	6.41	.52
Continuance commitment	3.29	.69	4.15	.94	4.99	.66
Normative commitment	5.41	.69	5.84	.64	6.29	.47

Notes. Departments in Cluster 1 termed *High Affective and Normative/Diverse*; departments in Cluster 2 dubbed *High Affective and Normative/Homogeneous*; departments in Cluster 3 designated *High Commitment/Diverse*.

Table 8   Influence of Cluster Membership on Attraction of Diverse Fans, Employee Satisfaction, and Creativity (Study 3)

Cluster Membership	Diverse fans		Employee satisfaction		Creativity	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
HAN/D	4.46	.98	4.77	.96	5.42	.79
HAN/H	4.02	1.04	4.46	1.03	5.23	.75
HC/D	4.59	1.02	4.89	.87	5.67	.62

Notes. HAN/D = *High Affective and Normative/Diverse*; HAN/H = *High Affective and Normative/Homogeneous*; HC/D = *High Commitment/Diverse*.

commitments to diversity (and in some cases, also a continuance commitment), are likely to bring benefits to the organization when coupled with a diverse workforce. Absent such personnel heterogeneity, the advantages of high commitment mindsets are unlikely to materialize. This pattern is consistent with theoretical works (Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999) and related empirical advances (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Richard, 2000) that suggest that contextual factors within the organization interact with workplace diversity to affect subsequent outcomes.

General Discussion

The purpose of this research was to propose a multidimensional model of commitment to diversity, and in doing so, investigate possible antecedents and outcomes of the commitment mindsets. Results indicate that commitment to diversity consists of three distinct mindsets, as the three-factor model was the closest fitting model in all samples and was a statistically better fit than viable alternative models. Results also suggest that the three-factor model is equivalent across various subsamples based on sex and race. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, results from Study 3 indicate that, when considered in tandem with the sex and racial diversity of departmental personnel, the collective commitment to diversity mindsets reliably explained various measures of department performance. In the following sections, I highlight the contributions of the research, limitations, and future directions.

Contributions, Implications, Limitations, and Future Directions

This research makes several meaningful contributions. Past research (e.g., Hopkins et al., 2001; Ryan et al., 2003) has treated commitment as a unidimensional construct that the organization displays. The theoretically-driven research presented here addresses these limitations by illustrating that individuals express different commitment mindsets—that is, the forces that bind employees to that course of action can and do vary. Empirically, results from three studies with unique samples point to the sound psychometric properties of the instrument. The questionnaire's three dimensions are all internally consistent, there is validity evidence based on test content, validity evidence based on internal structure, and validity evidence based on relations of the commitment mindsets with other variables.

Findings from the study also have potential implications for practice. Results from Study 3 suggest that athletic departments that were demographically diverse *and* whose members expressed a strong commitment to diversity realized the most positive outcomes. These findings suggest that simply focusing on department demographics alone or commitment to diversity alone will be insufficient to realize the positive effects. Rather, administrators should seek to both increase the demographic diversity of the department and foster a commitment to diversity among departmental employees.

Recruitment and retention efforts can be devised to attract and retain a demographically diverse workforce (see McKay et al., 2007). It is instructive to return

to Meyer and Herscovitch's (2001) original theory to address ways to foster a commitment to diversity, particularly the affective and normative mindsets. These authors argued that people are likely to develop an affective commitment when they are intrinsically motivated to do so and when they recognize the value of those actions. Athletic administrators would do well then to highlight the ways that diversity can improve the workplace—in this case, through higher employee satisfaction, greater creativity, and the attraction of a diverse fan base—as department employees might be more motivated to support and be more cognizant of the benefits of diversity in the workplace. As Fink and Pastore (1999) have previously noted, "for diversity initiatives to be truly embedded within the organization, those in power must be convinced of diversity's relationship to organizational effectiveness" (p. 314). Furthermore, Meyer and Herscovitch suggested that a normative commitment might materialize when norms for demonstrating such support are in place, when people perceive a benefit with providing such support, and when people feel a sense of obligation to provide such backing. Athletic directors play a critical role in setting the culture and establishing the norms of the workplace. By actively demonstrating a commitment for diversity, athletic directors can model the expected behaviors to others (see also Bandura, 1977).

Despite the contributions of this research, there are several limitations. These include method variance, the cross-sectional nature of the studies, and the fact that data in Studies 2 and 3 were collected from only top administrators. All of these factors potentially limit the generalizability of the findings. The first concern is allayed somewhat by the poor fit of the one-factor model across all three studies, as Korsgaard and Roberson (1995) suggest that "if method variance is a significant problem, a simple model (e.g., single factor model) should fit the data as well as a more complex model" (p. 663). Thus, because the three-factor model was a better fitting model than was the one-factor model, method variance is likely not a concern. The second limitation can be remedied through longitudinal designs. The third limitation could have positively biased the mean scores, as top level administrators might have more optimistic views of their department than do their subordinators. While the mean scores might have been influenced by the sample, it is unclear if the relationships among the variables were. Future researchers should seek to include more varied samples.

In light of these findings, there are several avenues for future research. First, it is important to consider additional antecedents of the commitment mindsets to better understand how commitment to diversity is developed. Studies 1–3 suggest that demographics only marginally (if at all) affect one's commitment to diversity mindsets—a finding attributed to the within-group variance among persons from different groups. Given these findings, Meyer and Herscovitch's (2001) framework might provide some additional guidance, as future researchers should examine factors that might (a) intrinsically motivate people to support diversity, (b) lead them to find value in differences among people, (c) result in people perceiving high costs associated with not supporting diversity, and (d) lead to organizational norms for supporting diversity. In addition to these factors, however, researchers could also consider one's past diversity-related experiences (Allport, 1954), deep-level characteristics such as political affiliation (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000), and other organizational factors, such as the diversity mindset of the workplace (Ely & Thomas, 2001). Additional research is also needed to under-

stand other consequences of commitment to diversity, which may include attitudes toward the organization, citizenship behaviors, and turnover. Subsequent investigations will hopefully improve the understanding and application of the commitment to diversity construct and diversity issues in general.

Acknowledgment

References

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Anderson, E. (2002). Openly gay athletes: Contesting hegemonic masculinity in a homophobic environment. *Gender & Society, 16,* 860–877.

Arbuckle, J.L. (2006). *AMOS 7.0 user's guide*. Spring House, PA: AMOS Development Corporation.

Armstrong, K.L. (2002). An examination of the social psychology of Black's consumption of sport. *Journal of Sport Management, 16,* 267–288.

Avery, D.R. (2003). Reactions to diversity in recruitment advertising: Are differences black and white? *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 672–679.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology, 66,* 32–42.

Bleise, P.D. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analysis. In K.J. Klein & S.W.J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp. 349–381). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Byrne, B.M. (2004). Testing for multigroup invariance using AMOS graphics: A road less traveled. *Structural Equation Modeling, 11,* 272–300.

Chatman, J.A., Polzer, J.T., Barsade, S.G., & Neale, M.A. (1998). Being different yet feeling similar: The influence of demographic composition and organizational culture on work processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 43,* 749–780.

Cunningham, G.B. (2006). The relationship among commitment to change, coping with change, and turnover intentions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15,* 29–45.

Cunningham, G.B. (2007a). Opening the black box: The influence of perceived diversity and a common in-group identity in diverse groups. *Journal of Sport Management, 21,* 58–78.

Cunningham, G.B. (2007b). Perceptions as reality: The influence of actual and perceived demographic dissimilarity. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 22,* 79–89.

Cunningham, G.B., & Sagas, M. (2003). Treatment discrimination among coaches of women's teams. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 74,* 455–466.

Cunningham, G.B., & Sagas, M. (2004a). Group diversity, occupational commitment, and occupational turnover intentions among NCAA Division IA football coaching staffs. *Journal of Sport Management, 18,* 236–254.

Cunningham, G.B., & Sagas, M. (2004b). People make the difference: The influence of human capital and diversity on team performance. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 4,* 3–22.

Cunningham, G.B., & Sagas, M. (2004c). The effect of group diversity on organizational commitment. *International Sports Journal, 8*(1), 124–131.

Dillman, D.A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dixon, M.A., & Cunningham, G.B. (2006). Multi-level analysis in sport management: Conceptual issues and review of aggregation techniques. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science, 10*(2), 85–107.

Doherty, A.J., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). Managing cultural diversity in sport organizations: A theoretical perspective. *Journal of Sport Management, 13,* 280–297.

Dooley, L.M., & Linder, J.R. (2003). The handling of nonresponse error. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 14,* 99–110.

Ely, R.J., & Thomas, D.A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46,* 229–273.

Fink, J.S., & Pastore, D.L. (1999). Diversity in sport? Utilizing the business literature to devise a comprehensive framework of diversity initiatives. *Quest, 51,* 310–327.

Fink, J.S., Pastore, D.L., & Riemer, H.A. (2001). Do differences make a difference? Managing diversity in Division IA intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management, 15,* 10–50.

Florin, P., Giamartino, G.A., Kenny, D.A., & Wandersman, A. (1990). Levels of analysis and effects: Clarifying group influence and climate by separating individual and group effects. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 20,* 881–900.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

French, J. (2008, February 2). Student march precedes decision on gay rights law. *Mail Tribune*. Retrieved online February 4, 2008, at http://www.mailtribune.com.

Gaertner, S.L., & Dovidio, J.F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Hair, J.F., Jr., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hanisch, K.A., Hulin, C.L., & Roznowski, M. (1998). The importance of individuals' repertoires of behaviors: The scientific appropriateness of studying multiple behaviors and general attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19,* 463–480.

Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J.P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 474–487.

Hopkins, W.E., Hopkins, S.A., & Mallette, P. (2001). Diversity managerial value commitment: A test of some proposed relationships. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 13,* 288–306.

James, L.R., Demaree, R.G., & Wolf, G. (1993). r_{wg}: An assessment of within-group interrater agreement. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 306–309.

Kidder, D., Lankau, M., Chrobot-Mason, D., Mollica, K., & Friedman, R. (2004). Backlash towards diversity initiatives: Examining the impact of diversity program justifications, personal and group outcomes. *The International Journal of Conflict Management, 15,* 61–94.

Kinsey, A.C., Pomeroy, W.B., & Martin, C.E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders Co.

Klein, K.J., & Kozlowski, S.W.J. (Eds.). (2000). *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knoppers, A., Meyer, B.B., Ewing, M., & Forrest, L. (1993). Gender ratio and social interaction among college coaches. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 10,* 256–269.

Korsgaard, M.A., & Roberson, L. (1995). Procedural justice in performance evaluation—The role of instrumental and noninstrumental voice in performance –appraisal discussions. *Journal of Management, 21,* 657–669.

Krane, V., & Barber, H. (2005). Identity tensions in lesbian intercollegiate coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 76,* 67–81.

Lawrence, S.M. (2005). African American athletes' experiences of race in sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 40,* 99–110.

Lee, K., Carswell, J.J., & Allen, N.J. (2000). A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: Relations with person- and work-related variables. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 799–811.

Lovelace, K., Shapiro, D.L., & Weingart, L.R. (2001). Maximizing cross-functional new product teams' innovativeness and constrain adherence: A conflict communications perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 44,* 779–793.

Lutz, J.G., & Eckert, T.L. (1994). The relationship between canonical correlation analysis and multivariate multiple regression. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54,* 666–675.

McKay, P.F., Avery, D.R., Tonidandel, S., Morris, M.A., Hernandez, M., & Hebl, M.R. (2007). Racial differences in employee retention: Are climate perceptions the key? *Personnel Psychology, 60,* 35–62.

Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1,* 61–89.

Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Topolnytsky, L. (1998). Commitment in a changing world of work. *Canadian Psychology, 39,* 83–93.

Meyer, J.P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment to the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review, 11,* 299–326.

Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R. (1982). *Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

O'Reilly, C.A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 492–499.

Richard, O.C. (2000). Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 164–177.

Robinson, G., & Dechant, K. (1997). Building a business case for diversity. *Academy of Management Executive, 11*(3), 21–31.

Ryan, A.M., West, B.J., & Carr, J.Z. (2003). Effects of the terrorist attacks of 9/11/01 on employee attitudes. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 647–659.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40,* 437–453.

Shamir, B. (1991). Meaning, self and motivation in organizations. *Organization Studies, 12,* 405–424.

Shaw, S. (2006). Scratching the back of 'Mr X': Analyzing gendered social processes in sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management, 20*(4), 510–534.

Shaw, S. (2007). Touching the intangible? An analysis of *The Equality Standard: A Framework for Sport. Equal Opportunities International, 26,* 420–434.

Siciliano, J.I. (1996). The relationship of board member diversity to organizational performance. *Journal of Business Ethics, 15,* 1313–1320.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C.K.W., & Homan, A.C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 1008–1022.

van Knippenberg, D., & Haslam, S.A. (2003). Realizing the diversity dividend: Exploring the subtle interplay between identity, ideology, and reality. In S.A. Haslam, D. van Knippenberg, M.J. Platow, & N. Ellemers (Eds.), *Social identity at work: Developing theory for organizational practice* (pp. 61–77). New York: Psychology Press.

van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M.C. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58,* 515–541.